REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Office Action of October 31, 2007. This

Amendment is in full response thereto. Thus, Applicants respectfully request continued

examination and allowance of the application.

Claims 9-12 are pending of which 9-12 stand rejected. Claims 13-16 have been

withdrawn from consideration.

Election / Restrictions:

Group I, consisting of claims 9-12 and drawn to a process for producing carbon

monoxide by cryogenic distillation, is elected without traverse.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Fabian '621. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-12 are not unpatentable over

Fabian '621.

A number of elements that are required by independent claim 9 of the instant

application are missing from the disclosure provided by Fabian '621, in the specific

excerpts presented by the Examiner and elsewhere in Fabian '621.

Such missing elements include, but are not limited to, the stripping column

required by element c) of claim 9 of the instant application. Claim 9 requires the cooled

mixture to be partially condensed [element a)], separated to produce a carbon

monoxide-enriched liquid [element b)], which is sent to a stripping column to produce a

hydrogen-free liquid carbon monoxide [element c)], which is then sent to a distillation

column [element d)]. No stripping column is mentioned anywhere in the text of Fabian

**621**.

5

Appl. No. 10/572,668

Attorney Docket No. Serie 6373

Amdt. dated January 31, 2008

Reply to Office Action of October 31, 2007

Another such missing element include the requirement in element f) that the

"carbon monoxide-rich stream is withdrawn from a second intermediate point, the

second intermediate point being above the first intermediate point." The liquid carbon

dioxide is removed from the nitrogen separator column at the bottom (stream 60), and

not at an intermediate point above the first intermediate point (stream 55).

Hence, for at least these two reasons, Fabian '621 fails to teach or suggest the

instant invention, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Fabian '339. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-12 are not unpatentable over

Fabian '339.

A number of elements that are required by independent claim 9 of the instant

application are missing from the disclosure provided by Fabian '339, in the specific

excerpts presented by the Examiner and elsewhere in Fabian '339.

Such missing elements include, but are not limited to, the requirement in element

f) that the "carbon monoxide-rich stream is withdrawn from a second intermediate point,

the second intermediate point being above the first intermediate point." The liquid

carbon dioxide is removed from the (second) rectification column at the top (stream 16),

and not at an intermediate point above the first intermediate point (stream 55).

Applicants also respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that one

skilled in the art would find it obvious to take the double distillation column arrangement

of Fabian '339 and reduce it to a single distillation column arrangement based purely on

capital cost considerations. One skilled in this art would recognize that it would be very

difficult, possibly impossible, to collapse these two rectification columns, with all the

intermediate exchanges of heat, into a single column and retain the same product

6

Appl. No. 10/572,668

Attorney Docket No. Serie 6373

Amdt. dated January 31, 2008

Reply to Office Action of October 31, 2007

purity. If such a process degeneration were obvious and practical, one would have

expected the inventors of Fabian '339 to have found it with Occam's razor.

Hence, for at least these two reasons, Fabian '339 fails to teach or suggest the

instant invention, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition for

allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the examiner believe

a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he/she is invited to

call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

It is not believed that any fee is due at this time. If that belief is incorrect, please

debit deposit account number 01-1375. Also, the Commissioner is authorized to credit

any overpayment to deposit account number 01-1375.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elwood L. Haynes/

Elwood L. Haynes

Registration No. 55,254

Date: January 31, 2008

Air Liquide

2700 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1800

Houston, Texas 77056 Phone: (713) 624-8952

Fax: (713) 624-8950

7